arXiv:hep-ph/0411385v6 9 Mar 2007

Gravitational effects on critical Q-balls

Dimitrios Metaxas [1]

Department of Physics,
National Technical University of Athens,
Zografou Campus, 15780 Greece
metaxas@central.ntua.gr

Abstract

In a cosmological phase transition in theories that admit Q-balls there is a value of the soliton charge above which the soliton becomes unstable and expands, converting space to the true vacuum, much like a critical bubble in the case of ordinary tunneling. Here I consider the effects of gravity on these solitons and I calculate the lowest gravitational corrections to the critical radius and charge.

---

[1] previous address: Demokritos Institute for Nuclear Physics, Athens, Greece.

Non-topological solitons of the Q-ball type, exist in field theories with a global $U(1)$ symmetry [1, 2], may be formed in the early Universe with various mechanisms, and have important cosmological implications [3, 4, 5, 6].

Here I will be interested in the case of Q-balls that are formed in the context of a cosmological phase transition and may act as seeds for its nucleation. In the case of a first-order phase transition, when the symmetric vacuum becomes metastable, the potential energy density in the interior of the Q-balls becomes negative with respect to the potential energy density of the symmetric vacuum. Then, if a Q-ball has large enough charge, it becomes unstable and expands, converting space to the true vacuum, much like a critical bubble in the case of ordinary tunneling [7, 8, 9, 11]. Q-ball stability has also been investigated in other models that may be of cosmological relevance [12, 13]. These results may be important for cosmological phase transitions in theories that admit non-topological solitons, such as the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [8, 4, 9].

In these models, that exhibit a phase transition at or above the TeV scale, the calculation of the tunneling rate and the kinetics of the phase transition is done along the lines of [10] and gives a specific picture of the phase transition, its progress and its completion. However, when the theory admits topological or non-topological defects (solitons, monopoles, or Q-balls as in MSSM) the picture of the phase transition may be quite different [1, 7, 8, 11]. These defects may act as nucleations sites for the phase transition and accelerate its progress, facilitating its completion.

In the case of Q-balls, we are interested in the critical soliton charge Q_c (and the corresponding critical soliton radius R_c) above which the solitons become unstable and expand, converting space to the true vacuum and accelerating the phase transition [1, 7].

Here I will calculate the first-order gravitational corrections to this effect, that can mediate tunneling in curved space-time [14]. The effects of gravity to the ordinary bubble nucleation rate can be very distinct [15, 16, 17], due mainly to the finiteness of the compactified de Sitter space. Here, however, I will be interested only in the case where the relevant solitons are much smaller than the radius of the background de Sitter space, and I will calculate the lowest gravitational corrections to these solitons.

In the case of a de Sitter background, the effect of the cosmological expansion that I derive here is to decrease the values of Q_c and R_c, as is expected, thereby enhancing further the progress of the phase transition. Although the effect is of higher order, the correction to Q_c is finite and may be important, especially for small values of the supercooling parameter $\eta = (T_c - T)/T_c$, as will be shown here.

I will use the gravitational equations that describe Q-balls in curved space-time [18] in the thin-wall approximation and I will calculate the gravitational effects to the critical radius and critical charge that these Q-balls must have in order to mediate the phase transition.

Consider a quantum field theory of a complex scalar field Φ with a $U(1)$ symmetric scalar potential $U(\Phi)$. For spherically symmetric configurations with metric

$$ds^2 = B\,dt^2 - A\,dr^2 - r^2\,d\Omega \tag{1}$$

the action is

$$S = \int d^4x \left\{ -\frac{\sqrt{AB}}{16\pi G} + \sqrt{AB}\left[g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\Phi\partial_\nu\Phi^* - U(\Phi)\right] \right\} \tag{2}$$

and for solutions of the Q-ball type

$$\Phi = e^{i\omega t}\,\phi(r) \tag{3}$$

the field equations are

$$\left(\frac{r}{A}\right)' = 1 - 8\pi G r^2 \rho \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{B'}{B} + \frac{A'}{A} = 8\pi G A r(\rho + p) \tag{5}$$

$$\phi'' + \phi' \frac{1}{r^2}\sqrt{\frac{A}{B}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(r^2\sqrt{\frac{B}{A}}\right) - \frac{1}{2}A\frac{\partial U_\omega}{\partial \phi} = 0 \tag{6}$$

where

$$U_\omega(\phi) = U(\phi) - \frac{\omega^2}{B}\phi^2 \tag{7}$$

$$\rho = \frac{\omega^2}{B}\phi^2 + \frac{1}{A}\phi'^2 + U \tag{8}$$

$$p = \frac{\omega^2}{B}\phi^2 + \frac{1}{A}\phi'^2 - U \tag{9}$$

.

Now we consider a potential that has a local minimum U_0 at $\phi = 0$ and a global minimum U_c at $\phi = \phi_c$, with the height of the barrier much greater than $\varepsilon = U_0 - U_c$ the difference between the two minima. Like in the flat case [1, 7] this theory admits non-topological thin-wall solitons of the Q-ball type [18], where the field forms a bubble of radius R, inside the bubble the field is essentially constant and outside zero. For this kind of potential there is no minimum ω since $\phi = 0$ is already metastable, so the solutions have $\omega \approx 0$ and inside the bubble $\phi \approx \phi_c$ (these correspond to the type II solitons of [18]).

For the configuration inside the bubble we make the ansatz

$$A = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha r^2} \ , \quad B = 1 - \beta r^2 \tag{10}$$

where, in the weak gravity approximation,

$$\alpha R^2 \ , \quad \beta R^2 \ << 1 \tag{11}$$

and we get

$$\alpha = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(\omega^2 \phi_c^2 + U_c) \tag{12}$$

$$\beta = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(-2\omega^2 \phi_c^2 + U_c) \tag{13}$$

and our approximation is self-consistent when

$$G\omega^2 \phi_c^2 R^2 \ , \ GU_c R^2 \ << 1 \tag{14}$$

.

Now we calculate the values of the charge Q and the energy E_Q of this configuration, making the further approximation $\omega^2\phi^2 << U_c$, which holds for this kind of potentials. So our final approximations, to be checked later for self-consistency, are

$$G\omega^2 \phi_c^2 R^2 \ << \ GU_c R^2 \ << 1. \tag{15}$$

In our further calculations we keep the terms that are of lowest order in ω and G.

In this approximation the expression for the total charge gives

$$Q = 8\pi\omega \int_0^R dr \, r^2 \sqrt{AB} \phi_c^2 \approx 8\pi\omega\phi_c^2 \frac{R^3}{3} \tag{16}$$

and the expression for the soliton energy $E_Q = \int d^3x\rho$ becomes

$$E_Q = E_\omega + E_{surf} + E_{vol} \tag{17}$$

with

$$E_\omega = 4\pi\omega^2\phi_c^2(\frac{1}{3}R^3 + \frac{1}{5}\gamma R^5) \tag{18}$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{8\pi G}{3}U_c \tag{19}$$

and

$$E_{vol} = -\frac{4\pi R^3}{3}\varepsilon. \tag{20}$$

For the surface term, we assume that the soliton surface has a thickness δ and an average value of the potential U_s. Minimizing with respect to δ [7] we get

$$E_{surf} = 4\pi R^2\phi_c\sqrt{U_s}(2 - \gamma R^2). \tag{21}$$

Now the soliton radius can be found minimizing the energy with respect to R, and the critical radius and charge for these solitons are found from the simultaneous solution of [7, 8]

$$\frac{dE_Q}{dR} = \frac{d^2E_Q}{dR^2} = 0. \tag{22}$$

The critical radius in this approximation turns out to be

$$R_c = \frac{10\phi_c\sqrt{U_s}}{3\varepsilon\left(1 + \frac{52\cdot 10^2}{5\cdot 3^4}\frac{8\pi G}{3}\frac{U_cU_s\phi_c^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)} \tag{23}$$

and for the critical charge we get

$$Q_c^2 = \frac{2^{12}\pi^2 5^5}{3^9}\frac{\phi_c^8U_s^3}{\varepsilon^3\left(\varepsilon^2 + \frac{17\cdot 2^5\cdot 5^2\pi G}{3^4}\phi_c^2U_cU_s\right)}. \tag{24}$$

These are the first order gravitational corrections to the flat space expressions (that we get for $G = 0$). We see that the effect of the cosmological expansion has been to lower the values of the critical charge and the critical radius, as is expected, thereby facilitating the phase transition.

Now, in order to check for the validity of our approximations, we take $U_s \sim m^2\phi_c^2$ where m is a typical mass scale of the theory, and we see that our approximations (15) are equivalent to

$$\frac{m\phi_c^2\sqrt{U_c}}{M_P} << \varepsilon << U_c \tag{25}$$

where $M_P = G^{-1/2}$ is the Planck mass. So our approximations for this problem are self-consistent. Although the scale of the specific model (MSSM or other) is fixed, of order TeV or higher, the value of U_c, which corresponds to the cosmological constant term, is arbitrary, provided it it satisfies (25).

It is easy to see that the condition for stability, $E_Q < Qm$, is satisfied for generic values of the potential well below the Planck scale. We can also check that for the values of the parameters that satisfy (25) the soliton radius is much smaller than the radius of the compactified de Sitter space $R_{dS} \sim M_P/\sqrt{U_c}$, so we are indeed in the limit of weak gravity.

However, even though we are in the limit of weak gravity, the correction to Q_c derived here, may be finite, and even large for the cosmological phase transition. The production rate for non-topological solitons with charge Q in a cosmological setting is generically proportional to e^{-Q} [8, 11] and a change in Q_c gives important corrections regarding the progress and completion of the phase transition.

In order to see this we can consider a generic effective potential $U(\phi, T)$, depending on the temperature T, with the two degenerate minima (at $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = \phi_c$) at the critical temperature T_c. Then, slightly below the critical temperature, we have [10]

$$\varepsilon = g\,T^2\,\phi_c^2\,\eta \tag{26}$$

with g a coupling constant of the model and η the supercooling parameter $\eta = (T_c - T)/T$. Then we can calculate from (24) the decrease of the critical charge due to gravity

$$\delta Q_c \sim \frac{\phi_c^2}{m^2\eta^{5/2}}\left(\frac{m^2\phi_c^4\,U_c}{M_P^2\,\varepsilon^2}\right). \tag{27}$$

We see that, although our approximation (25) demands the second term in (27) to be small, the result for δQ_c may be large for sufficiently small values of the supercooling parameter η. It is for these cases of a "fast" phase transition that the results presented here are relevant and may give important corrections to the usual calculation of the false vacuum decay rate.

Generally the presence of solitonic configurations (of the type described here or other) greatly facilitates the progress and completion of the phase transition since they act as seeds for its nucleation, however the actual dynamics and kinematics of the transition are quite complicated since they depend on the interactions of these solitons with the heat bath. For a phase transition that occurs at a scale μ, we see from the previous expressions that the corrections calculated here are important when the transition proceeds with a small value of supercooling $\eta \sim \mu/M_P$. For the lowest scale supersymmetric models that admit such configurations, with μ of order of a few TeV this corresponds to $\eta \sim 10^{-16}$, that is very close to a second order phase transition. This is the case when these solitons are formed at high temperature, by thermal and charge fluctuations, before the onset of the first order phase transition, and as soon as the symmetric vacuum becomes metastable they become unstable and expand converting the space in the true vacuum. Similar estimates hold when we are interested in an intermediate scale phase transition, provided (25) is satisfied, the actual dynamics of the transition, however, may change these estimates.

In summary we see that the corrections calculated here have the expected effects for the case of non-topological solitons in an expanding de Sitter background, that is to decrease the critical radius and critical charge of the solitons. Although I worked in the limit of weak gravity, these effects show that, in the general case of vacuum decay in curved spacetime, such solitonic configurations may be important in the calculation of the rate of the phase transition.

Acknowledgements

Parts of this work were done while visiting Demokritos Institute of Nuclear Physics and the National Technical University of Athens. I would like to thank the people of the Physics Departments for their hospitality.

References

[1] S. Coleman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B262**, 263 (1985).

[2] T.D. Lee and Yang Pang, *Phys. Rept.* **221**, 251 (1992).

[3] A. Kusenko, *Phys. Lett.* **B405**, 108 (1997).

[4] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, *Phys. Lett.* **B425**, 309 (1998).

[5] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, *Phys. Rev.* **D61**, 041301 (2000).

[6] M. Postma, *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 085035 (2002).

[7] D. Spector, *Phys. Lett.* **194B**, 103 (1987).

[8] A. Kusenko, *Phys. Lett.* **406B**, 26 (1997).

[9] J. Ellis, K. Enqvist, D.V. Nanopoulos, K.A. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **225B**, 313 (1989).

[10] A. D. Linde, *Nucl. Phys.* **B216**, 421 (1983).

[11] D. Metaxas, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 083507 (2001).

[12] M. Axenides, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A7**, 7169 (1992).

[13] E. Palti, P. M. Saffin and E. J. Copeland, *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 083520 (2004).

[14] S. Coleman and F. de Luccia, *Phys. Rev.* **D21**, 3305 (1980).

[15] J. C. Hackworth and E. J. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 044014 (2005).

[16] V. Balek and M. Demetrian, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 023512 (2005).

[17] K. M. Lee and E. J. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 1088 (1987).

[18] T. Multamaki and I. Vilja, *Phys. Lett.* **542B**, 137, (2002).